

**General Plan 2020
Interest Group Committee Meeting Minutes
October 22, 2001**

Interest Group Committee:

Al Stehly	Farm Bureau
Bonnie Gendron	Back Country Coalition
Bruce Tabb	Environmental Development
Carolyn Chase	Coalition for Transportation Choices
Dan Silver	Endangered Habitats League
Diane Coombs	Citizen Coordinate for Century 3
Eric Bowlby	Sierra Club
Gary Piro	Save Our Land Values
Greg Lambron	Helix Land Company
Jim Whalen	Alliance for Habitat Conservation
Karen Messer	Buena Vista Audubon Society
Matt Adams	Building Industry Association
Michael Johnson	American Institute of Architects
Mike Stepner	SD Regional Economic Development Corporation
Phil Pryde	San Diego Audubon
Terry Barker	American Society of Landscape Architects
Tracy Morgan Hollingworth	SD Assn. of Realtors (Note – unauthorized alternate at this meeting)

Public at Large:

Barbara Lind	Jamul
Brent McDonald	Caltrans
Charlene Ayers	
Dave Shibley	
Devore Smith	Sierra Club
Dutch Van Dierendonck	Ramona Planning Group
Janet Anderson	SDNHM
Jeanne Pagett	Fallbrook
Julian Nava	Valley Center
Juliana Bugbee	Lakeside
Kris Preston	Friends of Hellhole Canyon
Lynne Baker	Endangered Habitats League
Mary Allison	USDRIC
Mike Thometz	MERIT
Parke Troutman	UCSD
Patricia Nava	Valley Center
Rick Landavazo	Friends of Hellhole Canyon
Thure Stedt	TRS Consultants
Troy Murphree	Sweetwater Authority

County Staff:

Karen Scarborough (DPLU, group facilitator)
Ivan Holler (DPLU)
Tim Popejoy (DPLU)
Michelle Yip (DPLU)
Aaron Barling (DPLU)
Tom Harron (County Counsel)
Bob Goralka (DPW)
Jonathan Smulian (WRT Consultant)

Agenda Item II: Logistics –

- a) Minutes for October 8, 2001
 - Whalen stated that he was glad to hear that County staff acknowledges that there is a need for changes.
 - Stehly moved to approve. Stepner seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.
- b) Steering Committee Update
 - Scarborough announced that the Steering Committee met on Saturday and that they discussed commercial and industrial land use designations and were presented modified versions of these designations. They also gave staff considerable direction for changes, to be presented at their next meeting on November 17th. The Steering Committee had trepidation over “change for change’s sake” and there was confusion over what was zoning, designations, and regional categories.

Agenda Item III: Process Update –

- Scarborough went through the agenda and stated that there would be an extensive presentation by staff, by request at the last meeting, on infrastructure, transportation, SPAs and circulation. The group will then move into the discussion of regional categories and make recommendations on the first three categories today. “Rural” will be discussed at the next meeting on November 5th.
- The structure map will progress to the draft of the land use distribution and will be presented. It is only a *draft* with population numbers being plugged into it with no other impacts used. The map is not going out for public review as it will merely be a *draft* to work with and build upon.
- Reminder of the fieldtrip on Monday the 29th to meet at DPLU at 9 am, lasting until 3 pm.

Agenda Item IV: Staff Presentations –

All overlays were presented on the draft regional structure map.

- b) Transportation/Transit
 - *Circulation Element overlay:* Holler began with the existing Circulation Element overlay. The map shows roads that are both planned as well as already built. Holler pointed out that the areas of proposed higher densities follow along with the circulation overlay and viewed Fallbrook and Ramona as examples.
 - Barling explained that the circulation element is comprised of eight maps, each which may be purchased at the County, and noted that the overlay is better explained in the distributed hand-out of the Circulation Element.
 - *Transit overlay:* There is a relationship with the red, yellow, and brown areas to the CE roads. Staff took into consideration Alan Hoffman’s points and SANDAG’s RTP in this transit overlay. Hoffman suggested setting aside the RTP and instead to reconsider the linkages that are present in the unincorporated communities. He identified several areas in the incorporated jurisdiction that can service the backbone of the transit plan. From that, we added on to those where we can establish links from unincorporated communities to the transit system. That is what you see represented here. Have here is a red and a yellow line. The red line or car is a line that runs all day with a frequency of about every 15 minutes and a speed of about 20 to 25 with more frequent stops. The yellow line that extends out to Alpine and Ramona, is really a line that has a similar frequency of 10 to 15 minutes but only runs during peak periods in the morning and the afternoons and has a higher speed of 30 to 40 miles per hour, it does not have the frequency of stops as the red line does. Hoffman has indicated to us that his purple line concept could be integrated at this point in time in many of the outlying communities. For example, you can see in Ramona, the tie in down here to a fairly heavy employment center in Poway and this really becomes a direct shot to the Mira Mesa transit station. Similarly you see in Fallbrook, the area indicated on the 15 and Hwy 76 that runs down the 15 corridor into Escondido. The only area we have a transit station associated with a rail connection is in North County Metro where we get to the San Marcos area, which is indicated on the map as well. We actually had more transit nodes

than what we ended up here after Hoffman's review. We had more potential nodes along the I-15 corridor but Hoffman suggested that it be removed so this is where we are at after subsequent meetings with Hoffman.

- Whalen asked if this has been adapted to the potential areas for densification. Holler responded that we looked at Valley Center, but the only potential opportunity would be a loop but not a yellow car loop and the problem right now of projecting growth in the future was that in Hoffman's opinion, there was an opportunity for the red car service that you pick up down here. Also, there is no connection illustrated on the 4-S ranch area. The reason is that there may be internal connections from this community to the red line in the future but it was really designed for that job balance with housing community. Based on our consultation with Hoffman, even with the growth projections that we have, it merited that additional service.
- Whalen asked if Hoffman has given us thresholds of development intensities that would drive the demand. Holler responded with a no in Valley Center, however we are really talking about something for all of this area that would be necessary to do that.
- Whalen asked what can be done there, if we are serious about backswaying all the development rights in the backcountry since we need to make sure there is infrastructure to support where they are going. Holler replied that we did talk about those kinds of concepts, it was suggested that we extend that service out to the casino and establish some additional transit network on this area. One example might be Lakeside but the concern here was the proximity to the trolley and the transit service that would link these folks to the trolley and whether it could survive based off the ridership you would get out of that area. He thought those opportunities presented themselves more in these areas than in North County.
- A member from the public asked if staff took into account the future traffic due to casinos. Holler replied that that is not part of the plan now. Part of the reason is that the distinction between the scenario here, going out to Hwy 76 is a terrible road to service the casino. Goralka stated that prime reservations, at some point, will likely have some connecting service on the 76 corridor with the dividers to one of the casinos. Scarborough recommended that all of the impacts associated with Indian lands (not only transportation) should be a future agenda item.
- Piro asked for actual numbers associated with the tribal gaming report and the projected effects on traffic congestion. Holler noted that there is an update to the tribal gaming report which will be released soon, which may contain significant changes to the current data.
- Piro asked about Hoffman's presentation in which he showed a line going through Valley Center out to the casinos and was wondering about the map being shown. Holler replied that the map shows the "yellow" and "red" transit lines, and that there were actually many more transit nodes that were considered by staff, they just were not on the map but will be considered. He explained that when staff included more nodes, there was talk of potential opportunities for densification in those areas.
- Scarborough added that the process of staff working with Hoffman was very interactive, with most of the planners present giving their input to Hoffman. Piro stated his wishes for the Interest Group to have time to handle the data themselves. Piro views the map in question as accommodating the existing distribution patterns and reducing sprawl but still wants to work with Hoffman on the process.
- Baker said that she believes that the reason why there are so few nodes on the map is because the system runs faster with fewer nodes. But in the long run she expects to see the purple car service, which is not on the map, going to a specific place. Holler responded by saying that Hoffman did not only establish where people would be taken from, but also established where they would be going. Baker mentioned that, for example, in Valley Center, many of the people who live there do not end up at the end of the transit node.
- Piro added that there are different levels of local service levels, as well as an express bus, to help out with the traffic going to the casinos. Holler mentioned that there are other lines than those shown, the blue line (in the transit first line), but the focus was on the unincorporated areas of the County.

a) Existing Facilities/Infrastructure

- *Water Service overlay:* Holler began by introducing the map of Valley Center's infrastructure, both water and sewer. The infrastructure is mapped and then rated as adequate existing infrastructure (brown), local infrastructure which is existing but needs many improvements, and no infrastructure or off-site infrastructure required (yellow). For example, an area is shown that has a tank and a line running to it, and we were being generous in considering it "local infrastructure,"

but in other cases, there were better networks than that. Shown here is all imported water, but some districts are groundwater dependant, such as Borrego.

- Tabb asked what the difference is between offsite infrastructure vs. local infrastructure within the categories. Holler replied that offsite means you are bringing in like a 36 inch diameter water line. Tabb added that even if you are in a local water district, you are going to utilize that facility from that water district. Holler responded that it might be that the district does not have the capability of currently providing that without some major system upgrade, that would be primarily the yellow vs. the green, the green is local infrastructure and the yellow would be other constraints as well.
- Whalen offered the following premises: 1) there will always be water west of the CWA line and there may not always be water east of the CWA line and 2) the CWA line can be changed, if it is done the cost of that water would be incrementally more because of how far out it is so if we are going to do something that is going to imply densification outside of the CWA, we can make those assumptions that we are going to be paying for it. Adams added the bottom line is that there will be water here, we are just going to have to pay more for it.
- *Sewer Service overlay*: Sewer is a much more limiting factor than water availability. The colors are the same on this [as water level of service], the brown color are areas where infrastructure is in place, green means local infrastructure required, and yellow means offsite is required, may be some availability. Some special categories here, which are essentially package plants that have been entitled but there is nothing in place but there are approvals.
- Chase asked to be shown the north-south outfall boundaries. Holler replied that this map shows the infrastructure in place. Chase stated that there are only two major outfalls and that one of the big limiting factors is ocean outfall. Holler replied that staff will look into it.
- Bowlby stated that these were good tools to look at to increase development and asked if the group could have something to leave with. Holler replied that he will see into reducing it and providing it as a handout but these overlays were done by hand.
- Pryde remarked that Julian is not listed on the overlay. Holler replied that Julian does have a limited capacity sewer system and the only answer he can give is that we did not illustrate it.
- Whalen stated that it looks like we were going to have to explore new technologies a bit more with sanitation handling vis-a-vis the packaging plant. There are certain conservation values that are not associated with outfall, are we going to be able to have this and know where we need to increase capacity. Holler replied that we have had this information for some time and that has been our tenets to dialogue with the district where additional capacity can be programmed.

c) SPA Evaluation

- Holler went over the criteria that staff has established by which we will be evaluating SPAs. This handout will be available at the next meeting.
- If an SPA is vested, we will retain the SPA. Holler stated that essentially, you have to build something to vest, which is typically associated with a building permit or expenditure of money, roads, those kinds of things on the project. Harron added that SPAs are a legislative act and you do not vest a legislative act. Only when you get to a building permit and spend money, do you actually vest. Van Dierendonck asked if you put roads in, is it vested. To give an idea of what this entails, Harron mentioned that the leading case is Afco builders and in that case, they spent over 11 million dollars in pre-approval improvements. They were not vested, there was a change in the plan, and they could not go forward.
- If there is an implementing plan but is not vested (a tentative map or use permit is the implementing plan with the SPA), we will evaluate it using some criteria, i.e. how long is it til the expiration date of the SPA. SPAs do have expiration dates and if it is a year or longer it is likely that we will retain that SPA, if it less than a year, we may need to look at it more closely. Another criteria is whether the status of the project is mapped for that SPA in process or has it been sitting dormant for some period of time with no activity. If there is some activity there, then we would go through and look at that activity. In cases like that, what we will be looking at is if the underlying implementing plans active, how long the SPA has been sitting there, and so on.
- If an SPA is adopted with no approval, expired, or withdrawn, we will evaluate it. We will look for when the SPA was adopted, how the attached density relates to the surrounding areas, whether the SPA offers a public benefit, and the kinds of specific criteria or limitations that can be imposed on that SPA itself. To give a general conceptual example, we would want to look at aspects like if all the proposed development in the area was kept off sensitive hillsides or bio areas and

concentrated down to one area. We would almost have to look at each individual SPA as we go through that.

- Three examples of things we are looking at now. Lakeside – High Meadows Ranch has a recorded map but the map may not be vested. It may have had a development agreement that went along with it and we believe the developer went into bankruptcy. Point out because we have a recorded map and a question on vesting so these things are not small issues that we have to evaluate. Jamul – Honey Springs Ranch has expired and the Board took an action to expire that SPA. North County Metro/Hidden Meadows – Meadow View Ranch is a paper SPA, no approved implementing plan has been associated with that but the owner of the SPA has been working on that.
- Barling stated that we have a total of about 100 SPAs in the County.
- Addressing Piro, Tabb stated that the removal of the SPA does not necessarily take away land value. There are places where eliminating SPAs is probably adding land value so he does not think that if the SPA is removed it would necessarily decrease the land value at all.

Agenda Item V: Draft Regional Categories (Option 1: Staff Recommended Categories)

- Scarborough stated that she would like the group to make their recommendations to staff. Steering Committee has already made their recommendations. They potentially wanted densities not attached, they wanted flexibility within their own right to be able to use what is appropriate to their perspective.
- Piro thinks that if we can get by on existing categories, we can save a lot of time. Stated that this group has said from day one that it was better to use the existing General Plan categories. Asked why we would want to change every terminology of the plan, why at this late hour do we want to change every single property to a new zone and a new plan.
- Coombs stated that her recollection of discussing the existing regional categories was that there was no consensus. Feels very strongly that the existing regional categories are tools that are useful in the existing General Plan. We are trying to come up with a regional plan that distributes population differently than the existing General Plan. Thinks the group should go ahead with the village core category that we have now because they blend themselves better to a type of plan that we are trying to get. Piro responded that he was not talking about doing away with the distribution but rather, only the definitions.
- Whalen feels that there has not been a compelling argument for change. Added that he was not concerned with the names but feels the land use designations are important. D. Silver agreed that names do not matter as long as they make sense.
- Adams stated that there are components of this that can satisfy all of our interests and concerns by utilizing the existing names and feels we should pursue them. If we reach a genuine consensus on the regional categories, no matter what we call them, the rest of this stuff is really going to fall into place. So this is a real critical component of what we are trying to do today and thinks that it would be helpful to go through these and identify the areas where we can use the existing information.
- Barker stated that what we are trying to do is improve communications with property owners and the general public. It is not unusual when designations change. Thinks old names are bureaucratic and very hard for the general public to understand, in which you have to read through long definitions. Names that we are using now are new, part of Smart Growth, speak to a new vision, and are much more descriptive so that one can understand.
- Tabb thinks it is a bigger question than categories. Question is are we going to revise the general plan or start from scratch.
- Piro agrees that a lot of the categories' words do not fit well into today's surroundings, like FUDA, but also feels that a lot of them do make sense. The compromise here is to use the old plan format but change some of these names, i.e. CUDA can be Village Core. We can eliminate FUDA because we all agree that it does not make sense, CUDA can be Village Core, Estate Development can be Core Support, there isn't much that needs to be changed. That can be done on the General Plan texts without changing the original maps.
- Bowlby asked about the urban limit line and Ag 20 and Ag 19.
- Holler stated that he agrees with many of the folks that say do not change for change's sake but that is not what staff is proposing. The paradigm from which staff started was the big concern for both the development community, as well as, for the community groups, which is certainty and that is one of the things that staff wants to do as we go through the process, is establish a higher degree of

certainty by establishing a framework that can do that both for the development community, as well as, for the communities, as they go through and review things. He contends that while the current plan has these existing categories and designations in it, it does not provide that degree of certainty. The biggest thing, with respect to the proposed categories, are that they were drafted from the concepts that were drawn from this group. If you compare the regional category map with the structure map, the two maps look vastly different and he thinks that is the type of difference that you see using one category framework against another. There is a tiny bit of FUDA in the County today so that category that does not serve us effectively any longer. Also added that ECA was a regional category that was developed pre-RPO and we have other ordinances so we may not necessarily need a ECA regional category. The main thing staff attempted to do was develop a heirarchy – regional category, to the land use designation, then down to the underlying zoning that corresponds to the concepts that came out of this group. The regional categories, to his understanding, were developed apart from the General Plan as a growth management tool. Agrees that if we cannot come up with something that responds to the concepts that provides a higher degree of certainty for both sides and is not an improvement, then he does not want to make the change. To answer Bowlby's question, Ag 20 is a land use designation under the regional categories and the urban limit line, in the current plan, is defined as a combination of the CUDA and FUDA areas, so essentially it is the CUDA area. On the structure map, based on the concepts, the extent of the yellow areas could also be considered as an urban limit line, which is essentially the paradigm that this group is operating from.

- Silver asked Piro if there is anything wrong with any of the regional categories that are in option 1. Stated that the group should just improve them and if not, then to just adopt them. Piro replied that it is the methodology of going through all of the plan maps and starting from scratch. Agreed to changing the names but insisted on using the existing general plan format.
- Scarborough asked Piro if it is the map he is concerned about changing or the words that are attached to the map. Piro replied that it is not the map itself because we are looking at the structure map. Scarborough added, which is headed to a draft distribution map. Piro added that one problem is that we would be redrafting all of our General Plan texts, as well as, every community plan map just because we are changing the nomenclature, when some of them do not necessarily have to be done. The other problem is that if you think writing a friendly document will keep us out of court, you have more of a chance of being sued. Holler stated that we are talking about the categories at this point in time, not the designations and disagrees that changing the regional categories would cause a problem with a rezone on the approximate 200,000 parcels in the County.
- Whalen thinks this is relevant to TDRs and stated that it has always been his working assumption that when we decide the value of what is going to be conveyed out of the backcountry and into what we call the front country, it is going to be based off what is there today. He asked if we are going to change the regional categories and the land use designations, does it mess up our evaluation process for TDRs, or not. Holler responded that essentially you are still left at the end, with dealing with implementation techniques in a TDR program, of a comparison between existing and proposed and establishing the value of a TDR.
- Whalen had Thure Stedt speak on his behalf. Stedt represents himself. He has a planning and environmental consulting firm called TRS Consultants. He also worked for the County of San Diego for four years in the '70s and had a business of his own for over 20 years. Stedt stated that he believes that what we are talking about is a super structuralized pyramid – if you change the structure at the top (what we are calling regional categories), you disrupt the structure at the bottom, and it will fall apart at the designation. If you change RDA, in terms of the concept and not just the word, to the concept of Rural, you will have to change every single designation that falls under the regional category.
- Messer asked Stedt to give an example of a designation which would no longer be compatible. Stedt responded that in the RDA, for instance, you can have a Multiple Rural Use which allows four acres under certain circumstances. Under that proposal, his understanding is that that four acres will no longer be an option.
- Holler stated that he respectfully disagrees with the part of changing the categories necessarily corrupting the relationship of the land use designations that lie underneath it. Added that one of the things that we have to be careful of pointing to is the compatibility matrix in the Land Use Element as a legal document, as it was created for staff's assistance and is not part of the plan, so he does think that we have an opportunity to have a better relationship between the regional categories and the underlying designations through this process. Also wanted to point out that the structure map as being the basis, staff had to assemble ranges of densities to get to the point of creating the structure map.

- Pryde stated that this past meeting, the group had said that we did not think 29 du/ac was appropriate for east of the CWA. Almost all of the country towns on the existing plan are east of the CWA and there becomes the 29 du/ac that we wanted to get rid of. We are trying to get beyond that and correct the problems that exist in the present General Plan and that is one of them.
- Messer stated that Piro's last remarks, clarifying what land use designations would be allowed under option 3 and what would be perhaps disallowed under option 1, for example, four acre zoning east of the CWA has been one of our bottom line principles discussed at this table. It has been repeatedly agreed upon that further subdivisions in the backcountry is not good planning and is not what we want to encourage, so she does not feel that the group can achieve their goals with the old categories and thinks that they should be discussing the wording on this page to make them more compatible with the structure map.
- **Motion:** Silver crafted the following motion pertaining to use the regional categories listed in option 1: To use the regional categories listed on the option 1 page, use land use designations, if they make sense, use the old ones, or make new ones that best fit what the categories are.
- Silver added that we are all in favor of the TDR program but thinks we would be much better off if we did not link TDRs to the designators because what we are trying to capture is land value and there might not be a correlation between the designator and the land value. We may need a separate overlay for the TDR affiliated land value.
- Coombs feels that the group needs to move forward and stated that Silver is headed in the direction she would like to go. Seconded the motion with Chase.
- Through a point of order, Piro asked Whalen if he had seconded his motion. Whalen stated that he thought he did but did not recall. Piro's motion was not placed on the table as there was no second to the motion.
- Piro stated that he is against Silver's motion and stated that Silver is doing the opposite of what needs to be done. Believes that using the existing map and changing designators to conform with the concepts can be delegated. Stated in his proposal, we can change the densities by using the existing plan so he is talking about the format or the plan itself.
- Bowlby asked what the Steering Committee had decided on. Scarborough responded that they had made recommendations off of the proposed categories to staff (option 1), so they are using this terminology.
- Chase asked why the transit node concept that is listed in option 2, was not listed in option 1. Holler replied that it is still there but it would not exist as a regional category. The use of transit nodes are still in play but would not fit as a regional category because you are talking about a node or a station but not a regional category.
- Whalen and Adams stated they were confused about what the group was trying to decide on and were unsure of the motion. Scarborough responded that old definitions do not mean as much to those who have worked with them for 20 or 30 years. To her, where we are headed, she thought we had agreed to a new place where we can identify visionary Smart Growth, a new way to have our County, protect our resources, protect our backcountry, focus our development into areas that will emphasize transit opportunities, and get us into a new millenium. Staff has said that there are aspects of the plan that do not provide certainty or actually provide complexity or confusion within the existing document. She sees creating a new vision with categories that will then define the process. We have not defined the process by which you get from the existing to the new yet but as we achieve a new vision, what comes along with those, are new definitions of what we are headed to. There has been a new being of life that have come into existence since '79 when the old one existed, like MSCP, in which we have yet to discuss. She understands the motion to be an attempt, from a pyramid perspective, to create the top of the pyramid so it does not shake the bottom, rather it reinforces it, puts concrete in there, to substantiate the new vision, and through our "toolbox" and through the motion she understands, we head towards village core, village, maybe we collapse and call it a country town, and semi-rural estates and rural lands. But we are headed towards protection and an increase in density areas and the mechanism to get from one designator to another. Silver's motion says to use the old ones to eliminate any confusion, unless it does not make sense to the top of the pyramid. If it does, maybe they need to come back here and we need to discuss the modifications to the designators that they would propose.
- A three-minute caucus was permitted in order to call the question.
- **Vote:** Use the regional categories in option 1 and then staff will supply land use designations where the old ones make sense and if they do not, they will make new ones.
 - ⇒ Favored: 11
 - ⇒ Opposed: 5 (Piro, Adams, Lambron, Whalen, and Hollingworth)

⇒ Abstained: 1 (Stehly)

Agenda Item VII: Status & Review –

- Review of the “10 points” of the Interest Group.
- Holler wanted the group to know staff’s position on such issues and that staff agrees with the need to update the elements as indicated in “a” (changes to the General Plan elements for internal consistency). Staff agrees that there are inconsistencies in the goals and policies that need to be revisited. Staff agrees with items “c” (update distribution model commensurate with capacity of existing and planned infrastructure) and “d” (community character: self-definition and criteria for updating plans).

Agenda Item VIII: Public Comments

- Rick Landavazo: Friends of Hellhole Canyon urges the protection of the preserve, with low density designations of 40 acres or greater on lands adjacent to the preserve or critical to the biological integrity of the preserve. The preserve deserves special attention because of its unique location. The CWA border is the property line between the preserve and large agricultural properties to the south and east. These large agricultural tracts are currently not subdivided and provide necessary buffering of the preserve against development impacts, therefore we are urging varying low designations on these lands to protect this natural resource. We also believe this makes “Smart Growth” sense, because these agricultural lands are very far from Valley Center’s town center.
- Kris Preston: We were very concerned when we saw this project. We were trying to create an open space system for Valley Center. We have one large open space preserve which is Hellhole Canyon and a little bit of BLM land, with nothing else in the works and very few parks in the area. We did an analysis of what would be biologically sensitive in the Valley Center area and then overlaid this onto topography. Valley Center is an area that still has a lot of unconstrained land, so we are concerned that we keep these corridors open between Valley Center and the Cleveland National Forest, Palomar Mountain area, San Luis Rey River, Santa Rosa Plateau, Lake Wolport, and Daley Ranch. We have presented the map to Larry Glavinic (VCCPG Chair) and he agreed with much of the map. Basically what we would like is low densities in the steep areas with sensitive resources. Much of the land that we are looking at is currently in 40 acre or larger parcels, so we basically want these areas kept in the rural designation.
- Todd Ruth: Agrees with “green” requiring TDRs and transfers from “red”, and agrees with TDRs as a means to getting to “green.” Only concern is what about GP2040. There are areas that we want to preserve and we are interested in Smart Growth and putting “red” in the center of town. That is going to require increasing density to a level that Valley Center has not seen before and is a lot more than we were planning for. It has to be financially viable in this receiving area, so that there would be sending areas, basically so we can get the “green”. That is going to scare a lot of people, because they would not want a sewer which would induce growth. When GP2040 comes around, there is no guarantee that the County will revert back and take out some of the “green”. Asking, similar to the compensation methods in the TDR program, to also implement conservation easements including a local conservation organization.
- Dave Shibley: Distributed handout, wants to show how difficult it will be to try and achieve. You should understand the difficulties with trying to rezone 200,000 parcels even though it is on a voluntary basis.